

### REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the present application. The non-final Office Action dated April 17, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, Applicants have amended the specification to correct minor typographical errors and claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of the invention. Claims 1-30 are pending. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,946,066, issued to Lee et al. (hereafter "Lee"). Applicants traverse this rejection because Lee fails to teach or suggest each of the features recited in the claims of the present application. For example, Lee fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, at least one common line in the pixel region, the common line crossing the data lines, the data electrode, and the common electrode, wherein the common line is formed on a different layer from the gate lines, as recited in independent claim 1.

Since Lee fails to teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1, Lee does not anticipate the present invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 8 are requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2, 4-7 and 9-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,207, issued to Asada et al. (hereafter "Asada"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because neither Lee nor Asada, analyzed alone or in any combination, teach or suggest all the combined features recited in the claims of the present invention. In particular, the applied combination of Lee and Asada

fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device having at least the following:

“at least one common line in the pixel region, the common line crossing the data lines, the data electrode, and the common electrode, wherein the common line is formed on a different layer from the gate lines” as recited in independent claim 1;

*added by amendment*  
“at least one light shielding layer on the pixel region, the light shielding layer crossing the data lines, the data electrode, and the common electrode at respective ones of the data line bent portions, the data electrode bent portions and the common electrode bent portions, wherein the light shielding layer is formed on a different layer from the gate lines”, as recited in independent claim 10;

“a plurality of auxiliary common lines on the bent portions of the data electrodes and the common electrodes”, as recited in independent claim 12; and


“common lines on the bent portions of the data lines, the data electrodes and the common electrodes”, as recited in independent claim 24.

Since neither Lee nor Asada, analyzed alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above features of claims 1, 10, 12 and 24, Applicants respectfully submit independent claim 1 and its rejected dependent claims 2, 4-7 and 9, independent claim 10 and its rejected dependent claim 11, independent claim 12 and its rejected dependent claims 13-23, and independent claim 24 and its rejected dependent claims 25-30 are patentable over Lee and Asada. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 4-7 and 9-30 are requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

Dated: July 17, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

  
By Rebecca Goldman Rudich  
Registration No.: 41,786  
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorney for Applicants